arXiv:1203.6237v1 [math.CO] 28 Mar 2012

AREAS OF RECTANGLES AND PRODUCT SETS OF SUM SETS

OLIVER ROCHE-NEWTON AND MISHA RUDNEV

Abstract. Given two points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^2$, the area of the rectangle with points p and q at opposite corners can be calculated. In this paper, it is proven that N points in the plane generate $\Omega(\frac{N}{\log N})$ rectangles with distinct areas, or alternatively all areas are zero. Consequently, the following near-optimal sum-product type estimate for discrete sets of reals A, B is obtained:

$$|(A \pm B) \cdot (A \pm B)| \gg \frac{|A||B|}{\log |A| + \log |B|}.$$

The signed area of the rectangle with the diagonal $[pq]$ equals the square of the Minkowski distance between the points p, q, and the proof of our main result is in essence an adaptation of the Guth-Katz proof of the Erdős distance conjecture to the case of the Minkowski distance. It requires a certain amount of care, however, because one of the assumptions of the Guth-Katz incidence theorem in $\mathbb{R}^3$ may get violated violated, owing to the possibility of having many zero Minkowski distances.

1. Introduction

The main result of this note if the following sum-product type inequality for finite sets A, B of reals:

$$|(A \pm B) \cdot (A \pm B)| \gg \frac{|A||B|}{\log |A| + \log |B|}. \tag{1}$$

As usual,

$$A + B = \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$$

denotes the sum set of A and B, the difference, product, etc. sets being similarly defined. Throughout, we use the standard notations $\ll, \gg$ to absorb unspecified universal constants c, C in inequalities, as well as $|\cdot|$ for finite cardinalities; $|A|, |B|, N \gg 1$ are viewed as asymptotic parameters.

The geometric way to arrive in the inequality (1) is as follows. For two points $p = (p_1, p_2)$ and $q = (q_1, q_2)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, the *rectangular area*, $R(p, q)$ between the two points is defined as

$$R(p, q) := (q_1 - p_1)(q_2 - p_2). \tag{2}$$

Observe that $R(p, q) = R(q, p)$ and that the absolute value of the signed quantity $R(p, q)$ is always equal to the area of the rectangle with p and q at opposite corners. Let's assume for now that p and q are points with no common coordinates. If p and

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 68R05,11B75.

q take up positions in the bottom left and top right corners of the rectangle, then $R(p,q) > 0$, whereas $R(p,q) < 0$ if the defining points are at the top left and bottom right corners of the rectangle. For a set P of points in the plane, let

$$R(P) := \{R(p,q) : p, q \in P\} \tag{3}$$

denote the set of all rectangular areas generated by P. The following result about the number of distinct rectangular areas will be proved.

Theorem 1. *Let P be a set of N points in the plane such that not all points of P lie on a single horizontal or vertical line. Then*

$$|R(P)| \gg \frac{N}{\log N}. \tag{4}$$

Let $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be another point set, also containing N elements, and define

$$R(P,Q) := \{R(p,q) : p \in P,\, q \in Q\}.$$

It is straightforward to adapt the forthcoming proof of Theorem 1 in order to show that

$$|R(P,Q)| \gg \frac{N}{\log N}. \tag{5}$$

Theorem 1 has immediate consequences when P is taken to be a Cartesian product. If $P = A \times A$, for some finite set A of reals, Theorem 1 gives the following estimate:

$$|(A - A) \cdot (A - A)| \gg \frac{|A|^2}{\log |A|}. \tag{6}$$

Furthermore, let $P = -A \times -A$ and $Q = A \times A$. Then (5) implies that

$$|(A + A) \cdot (A + A)| \gg \frac{|A|^2}{\log |A|}. \tag{7}$$

Similarly, one can choose $P = A \times B$, $Q = \pm B \times \pm A$ to arrive in (1).

The motivation for this result comes from two classical problems in geometric and arithmetic combinatorics: the Erdős distance problem, concerning the minimum number of distinct Euclidean distances that an arbitrary set of N points in $\mathbb{R}^2$ generates, and the Erdős-Szemerédi conjecture ([5]) that if A is a set of integers, then

$$|A + A| + |A \cdot A| \gg |A|^{2-o(1)}. \tag{8}$$

The Erdős distance problem was recently resolved by Guth and Katz ([7]). They proved that N points will always determine $\Omega(\frac{N}{\log N})$ distinct Euclidean distances by applying (at least) two main new ideas to the problem. One, due to Elekes and Sharir ([3]) was to interpret the plane problem about Euclidean distances as a three-dimensional incidence problem between straight lines in the real plane rigid motion group $SE2$. The other was to introduce the polynomial method, and in particular the polynomial version of the Ham Sandwich theorem of Stone and Tukey ([12])

attributed to Gromov ([6]) to prove a generally sharp upper bound for the number of incidences in the latter incidence problem.

More precisely, the estimate $\Omega(\frac{N}{\log N})$ for the number of distinct Euclidean distances generated by a set of N points in $\mathbb{R}^2$, after having been "lifted" into three dimensions, follows by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality from the following incidence theorem.

Theorem 2. *A set of N^2 lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that*
(i) no more than $O(N)$ lines are concurrent,
(ii) no more than $O(N)$ lines lie in a single plane,
(iii) no more than $O(N)$ lines lie in a single doubly ruled surface,
has $O\left(N^3 \log N\right)$ pair-wise intersections.

See the original paper of Guth and Katz ([7]) and the references contained therein for their other applications of these ideas shortly before they settled the Erdős distance problem.

These ideas have been taken up by others to achieve some progress in problems dealing with, e.g., sum and product sets. Iosevich and the authors of this note ([9]) obtained a near-optimal estimate

$$|A \cdot A \;\pm\; A \cdot A| \gg \frac{|A|^2}{\log |A|}, \tag{9}$$

after establishing the lower bound $\Omega(\frac{N}{\log N})$ for the number of distinct dot (cross) products defined by a plane set of (non-collinear) N points. The proof, after having interpreted the problem as a line incidence problem in the real three-dimensional group $SL2$, became essentially tantamount to checking the assumptions of Theorem 2 and applying it "as a hammer".

Jones ([11]) considered the action of the group $PSL2$ on the real projective line, with the objective of establishing the minimum number of "pinned" cross-ratios determined by a finite set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$. He proved, among other things, that

$$\left|\left\{\frac{a(b-c)}{b(a-c)} \,:\, a,b,c \in A\right\}\right| \gg \frac{|A|^2}{\log |A|}. \tag{10}$$

However, the incidence problem in three dimensions that ensued after "lifting" the problem on the real projective line to the symmetry group $PSL2$ turned out to be one between points and planes and it sufficed to use the older incidence theorems that go back into the early 1990s, e.g. a paper of Edelsbrunner et al ([2]), to prove (10) and other similar results in [11]. However there appears to be no immediate evidence that the estimate (10) is sharp, namely that one cannot have $|A|^{3-o(1)}$ there in the right-hand side.

The sum-product type bounds (1,6,7) are similar in appearance to (9), with addition and multiplication swapped. The latter estimate can also be modified in an obvious way to incorporate two sets A and B, where the cardinality $|A|$ and $|B|$ do not have to be comparable.

Note that if one replaces $(A-A)\cdot(A-A)$ in (6) by the ratio set $\frac{A-A}{A-A}$, then (when $|A|$ is an even integer) there is a bound

$$\left|\frac{A-A}{A-A}\right| \geq |A|^2, \tag{11}$$

which follows from the early 1980s result of Ungar ([14]) that $2N$ non-collinear points in the plane determine at least $2N$ distinct directions. The fact the number of distinct directions is $\Omega(N)$ had been already known prior to that, having been based on a considerably more straightforward way of using the order properties of the reals than the Szemerédi-Trotter incidence theorem ([13]), which plays a key role for the rest of the discussed results.

What has been termed in the outset as "rectangular area" between the points p, q is nothing else but the square of the Minkowski length (with the length element dl expressed in the affine (p_1, p_2)-coordinates as $dl^2 = dp_1 dp_2$) of the straight line segment $[pq]$, connecting the points p and q. The more traditional expression $dl^2 = (dp_1')^2 - (dp_2')^2$ for the square of the Minkowski distance element follows immediately after the linear change of variables

$$p_1 = p_1' + p_2', \qquad p_2 = p_1' - p_2'. \tag{12}$$

Thus Theorem 1 states nothing but that *if a set of N points in the plane is such that all pair-wise Minkowski distances are zero, then there are $\gg \frac{N}{\log N}$ distinct Minkowski distances.* Throughout the rest of the paper we work in the non-prime coordinates in (12), that is the "light cone" is the union of the x and y axes. Doing this spares the necessity of ever coming in this paper across hyperbolic functions to arrive at the parameterisations we aim for.

To stress the relationship of Theorem 1 to the Erdős-Szemerédi conjecture, it is worth mentioning that the Minkowski distance concept has been used in the 2007 paper of Hart et al ([8]) to establish a non-trivial, and the best at the time finite field sum-product inequality for sets $A \subset \mathbb{F}_q$ with cardinality $q^{0.5} \ll |A| \ll q^{0.7}$. The latter paper used Kloosterman sums to estimate the maximum number of times a single distance occurred, having followed the considerations in the paper [10] of Iosevich and the second author on the finite field version of the Euclidean distance. Likewise, the sum-product type estimate (1) is the main interest of this paper, and the variant of the Erdős distance problem for the Minkowski metric claimed by Theorem 1 is a vehicle to arrive in this estimates.

The proof of Theorem 1 follows closely the Guth-Katz approach to the Euclidean Erdős distance problem. To be precise, it will be shown that the problem of bounding from below the number of distinct rectangular areas can be reduced to the problem of bounding from above the number of pairwise intersections of a particular set of N^2 lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Each individual line l_{ps} is defined by a pair (p, s) of points in P and corresponds to a one-dimensional family of non-degenerate affine transformations of the plane which map p into s and preserve the Minkowski distance, alias rectangular area. Transformations of this type form a three-dimensional group $G_R = ISO(1,1)$, combining translations with the hyperbolic rotation group $SO(1,1)$. In the non-prime coordinates in (12) this means combining translations with non-degenerate dilations by factors $z, z^{-1},\ z\neq 0$, respectively in the two coordinate axes directions. A transformation that maps p into s is defined up to a left multiplication by an element of a subgroup of $ISO(1,1)$, which stabilises s. The latter subgroup is isomorphic to $SO(1,1)$, and is topologically a punctured line. Working with rectangular areas, that is using the non-prime coordinates in (12) allows for straightforward parameterisations for these lines.

Theorem 2 does not apply immediately to the set of lines $\{l_{ps}\}$, because the condition (ii) of the Theorem is not guaranteed to be satisfied. Generally (although not in the case $P=A\times A$) there may be "rich planes", namely those containing more than $O(N)$ lines. Rich planes, however, may be put into a one-to-one correspondence with pairs or "rich coordinates" of the set P, and thus, after possibly some pruning of the set P, each line l_{ps} may lie in no more than one such plane. Incidences solely between pairs of lines within an individual rich plane correspond to zero areas, whose L^2-count can be plentiful indeed: consider P equally distributed between two parallel vertical lines. Zero areas shall not be included into the general counting argument, and it takes some effort adapting the proof of Theorem 2 to take this into account. We make references to the technical aspects of the proof of the above theorem in [7] throughout, aiming to avoid repeating the arguments verbatim.

The rest of this paper will be concerned with the proof of Theorem 1.

2. Proof of Theorem 1

2.1. **Rectangular quadruples.** Following [3] and [7], the size $|R(P)|$ of the set of rectangular areas, or squares of Minkowski distances generated by P will be estimated by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality from the upper bound on the number of pairs of segments with equal Minkowski nonzero lengths, referred here as "rectangular quadruples".

For $x\in R(P)$, define its number of realisations

$$\mu(x):=|\{(p,q)\in P\times P: R(p,q)=x\}|.$$

Observe that

$$N^2=\sum_{x\in R(P)}\mu(x)=\sum_{x\neq 0}\mu(x)+|\{(p,q)\in P\times P: R(p,q)=0\}|. \tag{13}$$

Let us further use the notations $R^*(P)=R(P)\setminus\{0\}$, as well as $\mathbb{R}^*=\mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$.

We can assume from now on that a single vertical or horizontal line does not support more than cN points of P, for otherwise, as long as there is a point of P not supported on the latter line – a circumstance which can be assumed thanks to the hypotheses of Theorem 1 – we have $|R(P)|\gg N$.

Then it follows from (13) that

$$N^2\ll\sum_{x\in R^*(P)}\mu(x). \tag{14}$$

Indeed, if the second term in (13) were to exceed $2cN^2$, there would be a $p \in P$, such that $|\{q \in P : R(p,q) = 0\}| \geq 2cN$, hence a vertical or horizontal line supporting at least cN (but not all) points of P.

Hence, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$N^4 \ll \left(\sum_{x \in R^*(P)} \mu(x)^2 \right) |R(P)|. \tag{15}$$

A quadruple $(p,q,s,t) \in P$ is defined to be a *rectangular quadruple* if

$$R(p,q) = R(s,t) \neq 0. \tag{16}$$

Note that the quantity, denoted further as

$$\mathcal{Q} = \sum_{x \in R^*(P)} \mu(x)^2 \tag{17}$$

is the number of rectangular quadruples.

Theorem 1 then follows from the next Proposition, by combining it with (15).

Proposition 3. *For a set P of N points in the plane, the number of rectangular quadruples*

$$\mathcal{Q} \ll N^3 \log N. \tag{18}$$

2.2. **Isometries.** Next, following [3] and [7], the quantity $\mathcal{Q}$ is related to an incidence problem in the three-dimensional Lie group $ISO(1,1)$ of Minkowski isometries, that is affine transformations of the plane which preserve rectangular area and orientation.

Notation: 1) For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, the translation by (x,y) will be denoted by $T_{(x,y)}$. So $T_{(x,y)}(a,b) = (x+a, y+b)$.

2) For $z \in \mathbb{R}^*$, S_z denotes the rectangular area preserving dilation defined by $S_z(a,b) = (za, \frac{b}{z})$.

An affine map $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}^2$ is said to be *rectangle preserving* if it is of the form $\phi = T_{(x,y)} \circ S_z$, for some triple $(x,y,z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^*$. In other words, if $p = (p_1, p_2)$, then $\phi(p) = (x + zp_1, y + z^{-1}p_2)$. It is easy to check that rectangle preserving maps form a subgroup G_R of the group of affine transformations of the plane. In particular, if $\phi = T_{(x,y)} \circ S_z$, then $\phi^{-1} = T_{(-xz^{-1}, -yz)} \circ S_{z^{-1}}$. It is also easy to check that transformations from the group G_R preserve rectangular area.

Indeed, let $\phi = T_{(x,y)} \circ S_z$. Then $\phi(p_1,p_2) = (x + zp_1, y + z^{-1}p_2)$ and $\phi(q_1,q_2) = (x + zq_1, y + z^{-1}q_2)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} R(\phi(p), \phi(q)) &= (q_1 z + x - (p_1 z + x))(y + q_2 z^{-1} - (y + p_2 z^{-1})) \\ &= z(q_1 - p_1) z^{-1} (q_2 - p_2) \\ &= R(p,q). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Clearly, as $z = 0$ is not allowed, the group G_R has two connected components, and is, in fact, the group $ISO(1,1)$ of orientation and Minkowski metric preserving transformations of the plane, which follows from the rest of the lemmata in this section.

Lemma 4. *Let* $p, q, s, t \in P$ *such that* $R(p, q) \neq 0$*. Then* (p, q, s, t) *is a rectangular quadruple if and only if there exists some* $\phi \in G_R$ *such that* $\phi(p) = s$ *and* $\phi(q) = t$*.*

Proof. It remains to prove the necessity. By definition of rectangular quadruples, $R(p, q) = R(s, t) \neq 0$. Write $p = (p_1, p_2)$ and do the same for q, s and t. Note that $p_1 \neq q_1$, $s_1 \neq t_1$.

Consider the map $\phi = T_{(x,y)} \circ S_z$, where

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \frac{t_1 - s_1}{q_1 - p_1}, \\ x &= s_1 - z p_1, \\ y &= s_2 - z^{-1} p_2. \end{aligned}$$

This map is rectangle preserving, so all that is required is to check that $\phi(p_1, p_2) = (s_1, s_2)$ and $\phi(q_1, q_2) = (t_1, t_2)$. Indeed,

$$\phi(p_1, p_2) = (s_1 - zp_1 + zp_1, s_2 - z^{-1}p_2 + z^{-1}p_2) = (s_1, s_2),$$

as required. Also, since $(q_1 - p_1)(q_2 - p_2) = (t_1 - s_1)(t_2 - s_2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(q_1, q_2) &= (s_1 + z(q_1 - p_1), s_2 + z^{-1}(q_2 - p_2)) \\ &= \left(t_1, s_2 + z^{-1} \frac{(t_1 - s_1)(t_2 - s_2)}{q_1 - p_1} \right) \\ &= (t_1, t_2). \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 5. Note that the case of zero rectangular area shall be excluded indeed: if p and q share the same abscissa, while s and t share the same ordinate, then one has $0 = R(p, q) = R(s, t)$, but there is no $\phi \in G_R$ such that $\phi(p) = s$ and $\phi(q) = t$. Equivalently, there is no orientation-preserving transformation swapping the two branches of the light cone in two dimensions.

Definition 6. *Let* $p, s \in \mathbb{R}^2$*. Then*

$$L_{ps} := \{\phi \in G_R : \phi(p) = s.\}$$

Corollary 7. *Let* $p, q, s, t \in P$ *such that* $R(p, q) \neq 0$*. Then* (p, q, s, t) *is a rectangular quadruple if and only if* $L_{ps} \cap L_{qt} \neq \emptyset$*.*

Observe that for any quadruple (p, q, s, t) of points from $\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$|L_{ps} \cap L_{qt}| > 1 \iff (p, s) = (q, t). \tag{20}$$

Indeed, the condition $|L_{ps} \cap L_{qt}| > 1$ means, in particular, that the system of linear equations $s_1 = x + zp_1$, $t_1 = x + zq_1$ has more than one solution (x, z), which may only happen if $q_1 = p_1$, $s_1 = t_1$. Similarly $|L_{ps} \cap L_{qt}| > 1$ implies that $q_2 = p_2$, $s_2 = t_2$.

Definition 8. *Let* $\Psi : G_R \to \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^*$ *be the map defined by*

$$\Psi(T_{(x,y)} \circ S_z) := (x, yz, z).$$

Since $z \neq 0$, Ψ is a bijection.

Lemma 9. *Let* $p, s \in \mathbb{R}^2$. *Then* $l_{ps} = \Psi(L_{ps})$ *is a line in* $\mathbb{R}^3$, *punctured at* $z = 0$.

Proof. Write $p = (p_1, p_2)$ and $s = (s_1, s_2)$. Then

$$L_{ps} = \{(\phi = T_{x,y} \circ S_z) : s_1 = x + zp_1, s_2 = y + z^{-1}p_2\}.$$

Hence, for $z \in \mathbb{R}^*$,

$$x = s_1 - p_1 z, \qquad yz = -p_2 + s_2 z, \qquad z = z,$$

which parameterises a punctured straight line in the coordinates (x, yz, z). $\square$

Denote

$$L = \{l_{ps} : p, s \in P\}.$$

So L is a set of N^2 lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$, punctured at $z = 0$, whose elements $l_{ps} = \Psi(L_{ps})$, after an obvious change of signs to symmetrize things, are

$$l_{ps} = \{(x, y, z) : x = s_1 + p_1 z,\ y = p_2 + s_2 z,\ z \neq 0\}. \tag{21}$$

Remark 10. Note that the set L_{ps} is the right coset in G_R of the translation that takes p to s by the subgroup stabilising s, which is the $SO(1,1)$-type subgroup of hyperbolic rotations, with s as the origin. Topologically $SO(1,1) \cong \mathbb{R} \sqcup \mathbb{R}$, a punctured line, the equation (21) providing an explicit parameterisation for the line.

We summarise the argument so far as follows.

Corollary 11. *Let* $p, q, s, t \in P$, *such that* $R(p, q) \neq 0$. *Then* (p, q, s, t) *is a rectangular quadruple only if* $l_{ps} \cap l_{qt} \neq \emptyset$. *Thus if* S *is a set of points in* $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^*$ *where pairs of distinct lines intersect, and for* $\sigma \in S$, $n(\sigma)$ *denotes the number of pairs of distinct lines from* L *intersecting at* σ, *then*

$$\mathcal{Q} \leq \sum_{\sigma \in S} n(\sigma). \tag{22}$$

Corollary 11 means that the problem of counting the number of non-zero solutions to (16) to prove Proposition 3 has been reduced to a question about the number of pairwise crossings of a set of N^2 lines in $\mathbb{R}^3$. However, (22) may be refined a step further, as not all pairwise intersections should be counted: an intersection $l_{ps} \cap l_{qt}$ yields a rectangular quadruple only if the points p, q do not share a common coordinate.

2.3. **Proof of Proposition 3.** Let us check the assumptions (i)-(iii) of Theorem 2 applied to the set L of lines. The second assumption is the one concerning almost all of the ensuing discussion, so it is considered last of the three.

(i) No more than N lines can be concurrent. This is indeed true. If more than N lines l_{ps} intersect at a point, there is some $p \in P$ and $\phi \in G_R$, such that $\phi(p) = s$, and $\phi(p) = s'$ for some distinct points s and s'. This is clearly a contradiction.

(iii) No more than $O(N)$ lines can lie in a single doubly ruled surface. The analysis of Proposition 2.8 and Lemma 2.9 from [7] can be copied verbatim to show that this condition holds.

(ii) Let π be some plane in $\mathbb{R}^3$, with equation $\alpha x + \beta y + \gamma z = \delta$. Consider the intersection of π and some line l_{ps} in L. This intersection is the set of all (x, y, z), with $z \neq 0$, that satisfy the following system of equations:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ccccccc} x & & & + & p_1 z & = & s_1, \\ & & y & + & s_2 z & = & p_2, \\ \alpha x & + & \beta y & + & \gamma z & = & \delta. \end{array}\right. \tag{23}$$

The line l_{pq} lies in the plane π only if (23) has infinitely many solutions. This happens only if the system of equations is degenerate, i.e., the rows of its coefficients are linearly dependent. This may not occur if $\alpha = \beta = 0$.

If the plane π is such that both $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$, then the linear dependence of the rows of the coefficients of (23) would mean that the quartet (p_1, p_2, s_1, s_2) is such that

$$\alpha p_1 + \beta s_2 = \gamma, \qquad \alpha s_1 + \beta p_2 = \delta.$$

Thus given $p = (p_1, p_2)$, there is only one possible $s = (s_1, s_2)$ to satisfy the above equations, and hence the plane π may not contain more than N lines from the set L.

Suppose now that the plane π is such that $\beta = 0$. Then we can fix $\alpha = 1$, and the linear dependence of the rows of the coefficients in (23) means that $p_1 = \gamma$, $s_1 = \delta$.

The same argument applies to the case $\alpha = 0$. Hence we have shown the following.

Lemma 12. *The assumption (ii) of Theorem 2 fails for some plane π if and only if π has equation*

(i) either $x + p_1 z = s_1$ where the coefficients (p_1, s_1) are such that there are $\gg N$ pairs of points (p, s), with abscissae p_1, s_1, respectively,

(ii) or $y + s_2 z = p_2$, where the coefficients (p_2, s_2) are such that there are $\gg N$ pairs of points (p, s), with ordinates p_2, s_2, respectively.

Remark 13. Note that in the special case $P = A \times A$ the above scenario in Lemma 12 cannot occur, and so all the conditions of Theorem 2 are satisfied. Therefore, the following analysis is not needed in order to prove the sum-product type estimates (6) and (7), which follow right at this point, by Theorem 2. (A slight generalisation of this is the Case 2 below.) However, the scenario in Lemma 12 already takes place if $P = A \times B$, with, say $|B| = o(|A|)$.

In view of Lemma 12, let us label an abscissa or ordinate *rich* if there are $> 2\sqrt{N}$ points of P having this abscissa or ordinate; otherwise it is labeled as poor. Then, since strictly less than each fourth point of P may have both coordinates labeled as rich, at least one of the following two cases always occurs.

Case 1. There is $P' \subseteq P$, containing at least 25% of points of P are such that one specific coordinate is rich and the other poor.

Case 2. There is $P' \subseteq P$, containing at 25% of points of P are such that both coordinates are poor.

If Case 2 occurs, then we replace P by P', restricting all the above constructs, such as $\mathcal{Q}$, L to it. It follows from Lemma 12 that the assumption (ii) of Theorem 2 is now satisfied. Theorem 1 follows.

Hence, throughout the rest of the proof it will be assumed that P is such that *all* its abscissae are rich and *all* ordinates are poor. That is, assumption (ii) of Theorem 2 fails in a plane π if and only if the equation of π is $x + p_1 z = s_1$, where p_1, s_1 are some two abscissae from P's set of abscissae. Let us refer to these planes as rich planes. Thus, each line l_{ps} defined in (21) lies in one and only one rich plane. Whenever we have, for some rich plane π, that π contains two distinct lines l_{ps} and l_{qt}, this means that $p_1 = q_1$ and $s_1 = t_1$, so $R(p,q) = R(s,t) = 0$, so the intersection of l_{ps} and l_{qt} does not contribute to the number of rectangular quadruples $\mathcal{Q}$. Thus we can refine (22) as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q} \ll \sum_{\sigma \in S} n^*(\sigma), \tag{24}$$

where $n^*(\sigma)$ is the number of pairs of distinct lines incident to σ, but not lying in the same rich plane.

To complete the proof of Proposition 3 let k be a dyadic integer, such that $2 \le k = 2^j \le \lceil \log_2 N \rceil$, and let S_k be a subset of S, containing all points σ, incident to a number of distinct lines from L in the interval $(k/2, k]$. It will be shown that for any $k = 2^j$ in the above interval,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_k} n^*(\sigma) \ll N^3, \tag{25}$$

which then guarantees (18). Following [7], the cases $k = 2$ and $3 \le k \le N$ are addressed separately.

The case $k = 2$. The assumption (ii) did matter for the case in [7], see Theorem 2.10 therein. However, adapting this case to the desired estimate (25) is trivial. Indeed, whenever some $\sigma \in S_2$ is such that the two lines incident to it lie in some rich plane, one has $n^*(\sigma) = 0$, i.e this σ does not contribute to the quantity $\mathcal{Q}$. At all other points $\sigma \in S_2$ the assumptions of Theorem 2.10 of [7] are satisfied. More precisely, for the set

$$S_2^* = \{\sigma \in S_2 : n^*(\sigma) > 0\},$$

the proof of Theorem 2.10 in [7] applies verbatim to yield the estimate $|S_2^*| \ll N^3$, and hence

$$\sum_{\sigma\in S_2} n^*(\sigma) \ll N^3.$$

The case $k \geq 3$. This case requires a slight adaptation of the proof of Proposition 4.7 in [7], whose statement, and basically *one* sub-estimate – coming from Lemma 4.21 in [7] – depend on assumption (ii) of Theorem 2. The following argument replaces Lemma 4.21 in the proof of Proposition 4.7 in [7], an adaptation which leads to the desired estimate (25). The reader is referred to the original paper [7] for the main body of the proof of Theorem 2 as well as the exhaustive description of its strategy and machinery used.

One chooses a parameter

$$d = CN^4|S_k|^{-1}k^{-3}, \tag{26}$$

for some large enough C, and uses the Polynomial Ham Sandwich theorem to decompose $\mathbb{R}^3$, by means of a polynomial surface $Z = \{P_d(x,y,z) = 0\}$ of degree d, for some polynomial P_d of three variables, into $\sim d^3$ disjoint open cells, each of which contains $\ll \frac{|S_k|}{d^3}$ points of S_k.

Observe that if it happens that $d \gg \frac{N}{k}$, then one has

$$|S_k| \ll \frac{N^3}{k^2}, \tag{27}$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{\sigma\in S_k} n(\sigma) \ll N^3,$$

which implies (25). So it can be assumed that

$$d \ll \frac{N}{k}. \tag{28}$$

Part of the set $S_k' \subseteq S_k$ may lie in the cells' interiors and part of it $S_k'' \subseteq S_k$ on their boundaries, that is on the surface Z.

The "cellular case" (Lemma 4.8 of [7]) applies verbatim, proving that

$$|S_k'| \ll \frac{N^3}{k^2}.$$

And hence the net contribution of the set S_k' to the quantity $\mathcal{Q}$ is $\ll k^2|S_k'| \ll N^3$.

It remains to consider the "algebraic case", where the subset S_k'' of points of S_k lying on the surface Z constitutes its large proportion. The algebraic case splits then into the "critical case" and the "flat case", as to whether $\sigma \in S_k''$ is a critical or flat point of Z. As far as the critical case is concerned, the considerations there in [7] do not invoke assumption (ii) and can be repeated verbatim, once again establishing the bound $\ll \frac{N^3}{k^2}$ for the total number of elements σ of S_k which lie on the surface Z and are critical points. And hence the net contribution of the set of critical points in S_k to the quantity $\mathcal{Q}$ is $O(N^3)$.

The last sub-case is the "flat subcase", concerning the points σ of S''_k which lie in Z and are such that there is a well-defined tangent plane to Z at σ. Such points belong to closures of two and only two cells. The analysis in [7] and the estimate $O(\frac{N^3}{k^2})$ *does not* apply *only* only to the set X_k of those points $\sigma \in S_k$ which *are supported in rich planes, which are factors of the polynomial* P_d.

Hence it remains to estimate the contribution to (25) of the set X_k to the number of rectangular quadruples $\mathcal{Q}$, using (24). For $\sigma \in X_k$, let $\pi(\sigma)$ be the unique rich plane which contains such σ and is a factor of Z. Let $k_1(\sigma) \ll k$ be the number of lines of L *transverse* to $\pi(\sigma)$ and incident to σ. The point σ contributes to the quantity $\mathcal{Q}$ only if $k_1 > 0$, the maximum contribution being $O(k_1 k)$. Fix a dyadic value of $1 \leq k_1 = 2^j \ll k$. Let X_{k,k_1} be the set of such points σ, for which the number of incident lines transverse to π is approximately k_1.

It can be assumed that k_1 is sufficiently small relative to k, that is for every $\sigma \in X_{k,k_1}$ in the number of transverse to $\pi(\sigma)$ lines incident to it is smaller than the number of lines incident to the point σ within $\pi(\sigma)$, denoted as $k_2(\sigma)$. This enables basically to discard the possible contribution k_1^2 of the point σ to the quantity $n^*(\sigma)$, by dominating it with $k_1 k_2$, or equivalently assuming that for all $\sigma \in X_k$, $k_2(\sigma) \gg k$.

Indeed, the cardinality of the set X'_k of points $\sigma \in X_k$, such that the number of lines transverse to $\pi(\sigma)$ at σ is $\geq ck$ is, bounded, by Bezout theorem, by $\frac{N^2 d}{ck}$. Substituting the value for d from (26) yields once more the bound $|X'_k| \ll \frac{N^3}{k^2}$, hence $O(N^3)$ for the contribution of the set X'_k to the rectangular quadruples count $\mathcal{Q}$.

Thus we can discard the set X'_k from X_k, that is assume that the quantity $n^*(\sigma)$ is $O(k_1 k_2)$. Summing these over σ is done further with some care in the following estimate (29), using the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem inside each plane π_i to avoid acquiring an extra logarithmic factor owing to the dyadic parameter k_1.

For rich planes π_i, $i \leq d$, which are factors of the polynomials P_d, let X_{π_i} be the subset of X_{k,k_1}, containing those points $\sigma \in X_{k,k_1}$, which lie in π_i. Let L_i be the set of lines of L contained in the plane π_i. Sets X_{π_i} for different values of i, containing flat points of Z, partition X_{k,k_1}. So for every i,

$$|X_{\pi_i}| \leq \frac{N^2}{k_1}.$$

The sets L_i are also disjoint, since each line of L lies in only one rich plane, so $\sum_i |L_i| \leq N^2$. Besides, $i \leq d$.

Then, if I_i denotes the set of incidences between L_i and X_{π_i}, then by the Szemerédi-Trotter theorem, and then applying the Hölder inequality to the lest term, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i |I_i| &\ll \sum_i |L_i| + |X_{\pi_i}| + (|L_i||X_{\pi_i}|)^{\frac{2}{3}} \ll N^2 + \frac{N^2}{k_1} d + \left(\frac{N^2}{k_1}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_i |L_i|^{\frac{2}{3}} \\ &\ll N^2 + \frac{N^2}{k_1} d + N^{\frac{8}{3}} k_1{}^{-\frac{2}{3}} d^{\frac{1}{3}}.\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Multiplying this by k_1, the approximate number of lines transverse to each π_i at each point $\sigma \in X_{k,k_1}$, summing over the dyadic values of k_1, from 1 up to k, taking into account that $d \ll \frac{N}{k}$, yields the desired estimate:

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_k''} n^*(\sigma) \ll N^3.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition 3 and Theorem 1.

$\square$

References

[1] G.R. Burton, G.B. Purdy. *The directions determined by n points in the plane.* J. London Math. Soc. (2) **20** (1979), no. 1, 109-114.

[2] H. Edelsbrunner, L. Guibas, M. Sharir. *The complexity of many cells in arrangements of planes and related problems.* Discrete Comput. Geom., **5**(2) (1990), 197-216.

[3] G. Elekes, M. Sharir. *Incidences in three dimensions and distinct distances in the plane.* Proceedings 26th ACM Symposium on Computational Geometry (2010), 413–422.

[4] P. Erdős. *On sets of distances of n points.* American Mathematical Monthly **53** (1946), 248-250.

[5] P. Erdős, E. Szemerédi. *On sums and products of integers.* Studies in Pure Math. (Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983), 213–218.

[6] M. Gromov. *Isoperimetry of waists and concentration of maps.* Geom. Funct. Anal. **13** (2003), 178–215.

[7] L. Guth, N. H. Katz. *On the Erdös distinct distance problem in the plane.* Preprint arXiv:math/1011.4105 (2010), 37pp.

[8] D. Hart, A. Iosevich, J. Solymosi. *Sum-product estimates in finite fields via Kloosterman sums.* Int. Math. Res. Not. no. 5 (2007), art. ID rnm007, 14 pp.

[9] A. Iosevich, O. Roche-Newton, M. Rudnev. *On an application of Guth-Katz theorem.* Math. Res. Lett. **18** (2011), no. 4, 691-697.

[10] A. Iosevich, M. Rudnev. *Erdős distance problem in vector spaces over finite fields.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), no. 12, 6127-6142.

[11] T.G.F. Jones. *New results for the growth of sets of real numbers.* Preprint arXiv:math/1202.4972 (2012), 10pp.

[12] A.H. Stone, J.W. Tukey. *Generalized "sandwich" theorems.* Duke Math. J. **9** (1942), 356-359.

[13] E. Szemerédi, W. T. Trotter. *Extremal problems in discrete geometry.* Combinatorica **3** (1983), 381–392.

[14] P. Ungar. $2N$ *noncollinear points determine at least* $2N$ *directions.* J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **33** (1982), no. 3, 343-347.

Oliver Roche-Newton, Department of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TW, United Kingdom
E-mail address: `maorn@bristol.ac.uk`

Misha Rudnev, Department of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TW, United Kingdom
E-mail address: `m.rudnev@bristol.ac.uk`